

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 7, 2007. Claims 21 to 25 and 27 are in the application, of which Claims 21 and 27 are still the only independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Office Action entered a rejection of all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,539,530 (Reifman) in view of U.S. Patent 5,452,289 (Sharma). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested, as explained in more detail below.

The invention concerns a print driver that is executed in the same computer terminal that also executes an application program. A document is accepted from the application program, and a setting screen is displayed. The setting screen allows an end user to set either one (or both) of a transmission setting and a print setting, and is displayed by calling the print driver in accordance with the end user's selection of a printing menu from the application program. The end user's selection of a transmission setting or a print setting is accepted, in accordance with the end user's selection from the setting screen, and there is thereafter a selection of whether the document is to be transmitted or printed. In the case of printing, print setting are set, whereas in the case of transmission, transmissions are set including a destination. The document is converted to image data which is printable form, and the image data is transmitted to the image processing apparatus, together with

appropriate ones of the print settings or transmission settings, for printing or transmission of the image data.

Thus, with specific focus on the display of a setting screen by which an end user can set any of a transmission setting or a print setting, the invention provides a natural interface with a user, since the user can use similar procedures to handle either transmission or printing of the document. Upon acceptance of the user's selection of the transmission setting or the print setting from the setting screen, the invention thereafter provides automatic processing of the document for printing or transmission.

On the contrary, the cited reference to Reifman is related to the user interface on the front panel of a stand-alone facsimile machine. As a consequence, Reifman is completely unrelated to the invention, since it does not concern a printer driver that is executed in the same computer terminal that also executes an application program from which the user can select a printing menu. Moreover, and as a further consequence of the stand-alone nature of Reifman's facsimile machine, Reifman also does not disclose or suggest display of a setting screen by which an end user can set either one of a transmission setting and a print setting, in which the display of the setting screen is initiated by calling the print driver in accordance with the end user's selection of the printing menu.

Because of the unrelated nature of Reifman, Applicants herein respectfully request a full articulation of the rationale as to why those of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine Reifman and Sharma. Currently, the Office Action asserts that Reifman and Sharma are combinable because they are both from the facsimile field of endeavor, and cites to Sharma's column 42, line 54, in support of its rationale that it would

have been obvious to combine Reifman with Sharma. Column 42 of Sharma provides as follows:

“The print file is then converted and imaged at 2705 into a PCX bit-mapped format which of [*sic*] the correct horizontal and vertical resolution in dots per inch (dpi) for high resolution facsimile devices”. (Sharma, column 42, lines 54-57).

It is not understood how Sharma's bare disclosure of conversion of a print file to a bit-mapped format somehow leads to a conclusion that it would have been obvious to combine Sharma with the stand-alone facsimile machine of Reifman, much less that such a combination would somehow result in the invention. It is therefore respectfully requested for the PTO to identify and articulate a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the prior art elements of Reifman and Sharma in the manner as claimed herein.

As for Sharma's disclosure, it describes a personal computer system (PCS) operable within the context of a personal computer having a Windows® operating system and hardware components including telephone communication equipment, digital signal processors, and hardware to enable voice, fax and data communications with remote sites. As discussed in connection with Figures 28 and 29 at column 42 of Sharma, a capability of the PCS software is tied to the windowing print system command, so that facsimile transmissions may be sent by any software that can print through the windowing environment. Sharma, however, does not involve the display of a setting screen by which an end user can set either one of a transmission setting and a print setting, much less that the display of such a screen is initiated by calling a print driver in accordance with an end

user's selection of a printing menu of an application program that executes on the same computer terminal as the print driver.

In maintaining the rejection over Reifman in view of Sharma, the Office Action took the position that Sharma shows display of a setting screen, in accordance with disclosure at column 42, lines 64 to 67. In addition, the Office Action took the position that display of a setting screen is initiated in response to a print command from a windowing system, pursuant to Sharma's disclosure at column 42, lines 47 to 64. See Office Action, page 2.

Applicants respectfully disagree with these positions taken by the Office Action. The cited portions of Sharma describe only the input of a telephone number and the name for a fax recipient. Thus, although some might take the position that these portions describe a transmission setting, they clearly do not also describe a print setting. The claims herein have thus been amended so as to emphasize that the displayed setting screen is a setting screen by which an end user can set either one of a transmission setting and a print setting, that display of the setting screen is initiated by calling a print driver in accordance with the end user's selection of a printing menu of the application program, and that the end user's selection (from the setting screen) of the transmission setting or the print setting is accepted.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Reifman and Sharma are not properly combinable, and that even if combined, the combination would not result in the as-claimed invention. Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Michael K. O'Neill". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Michael" being larger and more prominent than the last name "O'Neill".

Attorney for Applicants
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No. 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1419289v1